

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 8-10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,314) ("*Matsuzaki*"), and rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzaki*.

In response to the Final Office Action, Applicants filed a Request for Reconsideration. In response to the Request for Reconsideration, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action stating that *Matsuzaki* discloses a first transmitter for transmitting information to at least one information processing apparatus and a first receiver for receiving information from the at least one information processing apparatus in response to the information previously sent (Advisory Action at page 2). Applicants continue to traverse the Examiner's statements in the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action and present additional reasoning in support of Applicants' position.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 8-10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Matsuzaki*.

Claim 1 recites an information processing system including, for example:

at least one information processing apparatus . . .  
a control apparatus . . . and  
a master information processing apparatus . . . including . . .  
a first transmitter . . .  
a first receiver . . .  
a second transmitter . . . and  
a second receiver to receive registration conditions from said  
control apparatus, said registration conditions prepared in response to  
receiving said payment information from the master information

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

processing apparatus that settles payment for media contents received directly by said at least one information processing apparatus.

(emphasis added). According to the Examiner, the claimed at least one information processing apparatus corresponds to terminal 3 of *Matsuzaki*, and both the control apparatus and master information processing apparatus correspond to server 2 of *Matsuzaki* (Office Action at page 3). The Examiner cites Fig. 2, ref. 211/221/222/223, for “a second receiver to receive registration conditions from said control apparatus” (Office Action at page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner states that the master information processing apparatus in *Matsuzaki* is the server 2 (Office Action at page 3). However, the second receiver, characterized by the Examiner as referring to ref. 211, 221, 222, 223 of Fig. 2, receives “CONTRACT INFO” from the transmitting station (Office Action at page 4). As shown in Fig. 2, however, the transmitting station TS is separate from the server 2, characterized by the Examiner as corresponding to both the control apparatus and the master information processing apparatus. Information received by ref. 211, 221, 222, 223 of Fig. 2 is received from the transmitting station TS, not the server 2. Because this information is received from the transmitting station TS, it is not received from either the control apparatus or the master information processing apparatus. Therefore, *Matsuzaki* does not teach “a second receiver to receive registration conditions from said control apparatus, said registration conditions prepared in response to receiving said payment information from the master information processing apparatus”, as recited in claim 8.

Accordingly, *Matsuzaki* cannot anticipate claim 8, and claim 8 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 9-12 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 8. Independent claim 13, while of different scope, recites limitations similar to those of claim 8 and is thus allowable over *Matsuzaki* for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 8.


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 24, 2006

By:   
Michael R. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921